

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 were originally presented in the subject continuing application. Claims 1, 17, 33, 36 and 40 were amended in a response dated July 13, 2005. Claims 1, 8, 17, 33, 36 and 40 were amended, and claims 2, 5, 18, 21 and 38 canceled without prejudice, in a response dated September 18, 2006. Claim 40 has hereinabove been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-17, 19-37 and 39 have been allowed. No claims have herein been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9-17, 19, 20, 22-37, 39 and 40 remain in this case.

The addition of new matter has been scrupulously avoided. In that regard, support for the amendment to claim 40 can be found throughout the specification.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining ground of rejection.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

The Office Action rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. §101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 40 to recite at least one program storage device readable by a computer, rather than a machine. As amended, Applicants submit claim 40 overcomes the stated rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation allowed claims 1, 3, 4, 6-17, 19-37 and 39.

For all the above reasons, Applicants maintain that the claims of the subject application define patentable subject matter and earnestly request allowance of claim 40.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne F. Reinke
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 36,650

Dated: March 13, 2007.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579